

Response to Official Action
Application No. 09/785,573
Page 10

Amendments to the Drawings:

There are no amendments made to the Drawings herein.

REMARKS

By the foregoing Amendment, Claims 1-10 are cancelled. Entry of the Amendment, and favorable consideration thereof is earnestly requested.

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant admitted prior art in view of Castelli et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,535,872) and OLAP and OLAP Server Definitions. Claims 1-10 have been cancelled.

Claims 11-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable primarily over Applicant admitted prior art in view of Blackman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,360,229). Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider these rejections in view of the following Remarks.

The present invention, as claimed, is directed to an adaptive instantiation and inflation technique which is advantageously different than all instantiation and inflation techniques of which Appellant is aware. More specifically, as illustrated in Figure 5, object model software 18 receives an indication at 58 that the object model 28 is being first accessed. At this point, object model software 18 instantiates and inflates objects which have been previously specified for up-front instantiation and inflation at 60. At 62, object model software 18 receives indications that objects are being accessed. Next, at 64, object model software 18 instantiates and inflates on demand any objects which were not already instantiated and inflated up-front. (see Figure 5 and Paragraph [0040]).

Claims 11-43 of the present application all require, among other elements, object model software: (i) which instantiates and inflates a predefined group of specified objects up-front a first time the database is accessed, and (ii) which

instantiates and inflates nonspecified objects which are not included in the predefined group of specified objects on demand as each of the nonspecified objects is accessed. Thus, Claims 11, 24 and 27 of the present invention require a two-stage, adaptive instantiation and inflation.

As is recognized by the Examiner, Applicant admitted prior art does not disclose, teach or suggest this. Applicants further respectfully submit that Blackman et al. similarly does not disclose, teach or suggest in any way the two-stage, adaptive instantiation and inflation technique as claimed.

First, it should be noted that even if the Examiner's interpretation of Blackman et al. as teaching a two-stage adaptive technique were accurate, Blackman et al. would, at most, teach a two-stage adaptive instantiation technique, not a two-stage adaptive instantiation and inflation technique. As discussed above, all pending claims require, among other elements, object model software: (i) which instantiates and inflates a predefined group of specified objects up-front a first time the database is accessed, and (ii) which instantiates and inflates nonspecified objects which are not included in the predefined group of specified objects on demand as each of the nonspecified objects is accessed. However, there is no disclosure, teaching or suggestion whatsoever in Blackman et al. as to when inflation of objects occurs, and there is clearly no disclosure, teaching or suggestion that inflation of the objects may occur using the two-stage adaptive technique claimed.

Moreover, Applicant does not believe that the Examiner's interpretation of Blackman et al. as teaching a two-stage adaptive technique is accurate. Rather, Blackman discloses that "on demand" (i.e., either when the objects framework is loaded or when the application program first requests an appView object), an

instantiation routine is commenced. The instantiation routine, which is shown in Figure 3 and described in detail at Column 9, lines 26-61, involves instantiating the DL/I™ object, then instantiating the requested applView object, then instantiating the dbdView objects, then instantiating the iterator object, and then entering a loop wherein each of the business objects (BOs) and data objects (DOs) are instantiated/materialized. This technique is completely different than the novel technique claimed. More specifically, although Blackman discloses that there are numerous objects which are being instantiated, they are all instantiated when the objects framework is loaded or when the application program first requests an applView object. In Blackman, there is simply no disclosure, teaching or suggestion of a predefined group of specified objects which are instantiated upfront a first time the database is accessed, and objects which are not included in the predefined group of specified objects which are instantiated on demand as each of the nonspecified objects is accessed. Thus, although there are several objects which are being instantiated, they are instantiated in a single-stage process at either one of two times (i.e., either when the objects framework is loaded or when the application program first requests an applView object).

The Examiner cites several portions of Blackman as disclosing the claimed two-stage adaptive instantiation technique of the present invention. However, Applicant respectfully submits that it is only when these portions are taken out of context that they may appear to teach the claimed invention. For example, the Examiner cites Column 6, lines 35-38 and 43-45 as teaching that “the application program 106 dynamically loads previously-defined objects into the objects framework 108 to access the database 112 during execution time...the application program 106 first loads the objects framework 108 class library by instantiating the DL/I™ object...” However, the Examiner omits the further explanation that: “The objects loaded into the objects framework 108 include a DL/I™ object 200, one or


more applView objects 202, one or more dbdView objects 204, one or more business objects (BOs) 206, one or more data objects (DOs) 208, and an iterator object 210.” This is all of the objects that are to be instantiated, not “a predefined group of specified objects” which are instantiated in a first step of a two-step process as required by the claims in question. Moreover, the examiner omits the explanation that after the application program 106 first loads the objects framework 108 class library by instantiating the DL/I™ object, the application program 106 also instantiates “one applView object 202, and one dbdView object 204” and that “the objects framework 108 then dynamically loads in the BO 206 and DO 208 class library requested by the application program 106 to create an iterator object 210, which then instantiates the BOs 206 and their corresponding DOs 208 during execution”. This is a single stage process which may be commenced at either one of two times (i.e., either when the objects framework is loaded or when the application program first requests an applView object).

The Examiner also cites column 5, lines 3-8, which states that “the objects framework instantiates IMS™ data objects upon demand from application programs and manages those objects from creation to deletion. Further, the objects framework uses these objects to dynamically construct DL/I™ calls from application program requests.” However, again, when read in context (particularly in the context of the portion of Blackman which deal specifically with the instantiation routine, such as Figure 3 and Column 9, lines 26-61), this cited portion can be seen to mean that the objects framework instantiates all of the objects upon demand from application programs. This is not the claimed two-stage process. Furthermore, Appellant respectfully submits that the other portion of Blackman cited by the Examiner in the Advisory Action (column 8, line 66 - 67) relates to the creation of new objects, not the instantiation of nonspecified objects on demand as they are accessed, as is required by all of Claims 11-43.

Applicant respectfully submits that when Blackman is taken as a whole, rather than simply taking selected bits and pieces thereof out of context, the claimed two-stage, adaptive instantiation and inflation technique of the present invention is not disclosed, taught or suggested in any way, nor is there any motivation provided in Blackman to modify the device disclosed therein to provide such a two-stage, adaptive instantiation and inflation technique.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims, namely Claims 11-43, are patentable over the references of record, and earnestly solicits allowance of the same.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen P. McNamara, Reg. No. 32,745
Todd M. Oberdick, Reg. No. 44,268
ST. ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS LLC
986 Bedford Street
Stamford, Connecticut 06905-5619
(203) 324-6155
Attorneys for Applicant